DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 489 CG 007 042

AUTHOR Peterson, Harry L.
TITLE Youth, Discontent, and Social Change.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth, Boston.; Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston.
PUB DATE Jun 69
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; Individual Characteristics; Political Attitudes; *Political Socialization; Power Structure; *Psychological Characteristics; *Social Change; *Youth

ABSTRACT

This report on youth and politics was one of a series of working papers on the activities, and behavior of young people between 15 and 21 years of age. It was intended to provide background information while the Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth prepared a comprehensive report on the status of children and youth in the Commonwealth for the 1970 White House Conference on Children and Youth. Specifically, this paper explores some of the varieties of political activities among young people and discusses the reasons which prompt their discontent. In order, the paper covers: (1) Types of political behavior among young people; (2) Psychological characteristics of participants; (3) Recent history of political behavior; (4) goals of various organizations; (5) Tactics of different political groups; (6) Accomplishments of youth in politics; and (7) The future of youth in politics. (RK)

ED 060489

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

YOUTH, DISCONTENT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

by

Harry L. Peterson
Fellow, Community Mental Health Training Program
Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital

Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth
9 Newbury Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

June 1969

CG 007 042

FOREWORD

This report on youth and politics is one of a series of working papers on the activities, and behavior of young people between 15 and 21 years of age. It is intended to provide background information as the Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth prepares a comprehensive report on the status of children and youth in the Commonwealth for the 1970 White House Conference on Children and Youth.

The current report is the work of Harry L. Peterson, now a Fellow in the Community Mental Health Training Program of the Department of Psychiatry of the Massachusetts General Hospital. In July 1969, Mr. Peterson will assume his duties as Coordinator of Student Life Programs in the Student Affairs Office, University of Wisconsin at Green Bay.

In preparing his paper, Mr. Peterson has combined a thorough examination of the current writing on his subject with his personal observations while a student at the University of California at Berkeley during the Free Speech Movement in 1964, as a campaign worker for a peace candidate in California in 1966, and a participant in the campaign of Senator Eugene McCarthy for President in 1968.

Paul McGerigle
Research Director

INTRODUCTION

In the past several years increased political activism among young people has been variously described as a rebirth of idealism and hope in this country and as a major threat to the continuation of democracy in the United States. This paper will explore some of the varieties of political activities among these young people and will discuss the reasons which prompt their discontent. In order, it will cover: A. Types of political behavior among young people; B. Psychological characteristics of participants; C. Recent history of political behavior; D. Goals of various organizations; E. Tactics of different political groups; F. Accomplishments of youth in politics; and G. Future of youth in politics.

YOUTH, DISCONTENT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

A. TYPES OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOR AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE

It should be made very clear that there are no neat, agreed upon definitions for the groups, activities and beliefs of young activists. This does not mean, however, that they are so diverse that they defy any sort of description or categorization. We can begin by stating that there are some people who do not fall within this category. Hippies and frequent drug users are generally not involved in real, continuous political behavior. These political activists are not delinquents in the usual sense of that word, although a number of them have broken the law in acts of civil disobedience or, more recently, during on-campus activity such as sit-ins, or occupying buildings. They are definitely not Communists; that is, they do not belong to international organizations which are Communist in nature, nor do they receive their orders from any foreign source. Finally, and importantly, they do not constitute a majority of young people. Contrary to popular belief, young people generally are not active in politics. In the 1968 national elections about 54% of the 21 to 24 age group actually voted.[1/] The majority of people in this age category are not untouched by political activities, but are passive observers of the action. Although estimates vary, within the select, prestigious universities where political activists are especially concentrated they constitute 1 to 2% of the student body.[2/] Among the black activists located on college campuses or in the ghetto, the percentage of those involved appears to be higher although no exact figures are available.

Starting with the political right on the continuum and moving to those organizations on the left, I will review the activities of youth within these organizations. A number of these organizations have almost none or few youth active within them, others are dominated by young people.

The American Nazi Party is virtually unknown on college campuses, although there have been sporadic efforts to start chapters in universities. The late George Lincoln Rockwell spoke on many college campuses, with at least the partial goal of recruiting new supporters. The John Birch Society, likewise, is not particularly popular among young people with the exception of such right wing institutions as Bob Jones University in South Carolina. Young Americans for Freedom, a right wing Goldwaterite organization, appears to have hit its peak during the 1964 presidential election although it claims a membership of twenty to thirty thousand.[3] The Young Republicans and Young Democrats, which have a combined total membership of 250,000, have existed for some time with varying degrees of support from youth. Generally, they are more active during political campaigns and, because they frequently support positions at variance with those of their parties, appear to be sometimes embarrassing to their parent organizations. They are not particularly influential in the larger political organizations.

The supporters of Senator Eugene McCarthy and the late Senator Robert Kennedy form a more diffuse, traditionally inactive group than is generally believed. Although they are popularly depicted as representing the New Left style of politics with far reaching ideas for reform of the very foundations of our society, they are actually more middle of the road. Melvin Kahn, studying students in Milwaukee during the 1968 Wisconsin Presidential primary, found that fully 80% of those who filled out questionnaires felt that college teachers are interested in their students.[4] This is much milder than the

radical rhetoric of the New Left which attacks the faculty as not really caring about their students or bringing about social change and as "selling out." The background of the McCarthy-Kennedy supporters was similar in that they are from upper middle class families as are most New Left activists, but their criticism of the society in which they live is not so sweeping or basic. According to Kahn the forces which solidified the McCarthy campaign was the hatred of the Vietnamese War and an antipathy toward and a distrust of President Johnson.

A large majority of students who campaigned actively for Senators McCarthy and Kennedy were full-time college students. A number of students dropped out of college enrollment for one semester to assist in Senator McCarthy's campaign, but appeared to think of themselves as college students rather than participants in any full-time "movement." This is in contrast to those young people to the left of them politically who, although much smaller in number, are considerably more militant in belief and in activities. The latter are people who agree with many McCarthy-Kennedy supporters that the war in Vietnam and the racial problems are major dilemmas of this country, but they disagree as to the reasons this country has not found any solutions to these problems. The former group is apt to view the Vietnam War as a terrible mistake and has great interest in diverting monies to domestic problems. The more militant New Left sees these current difficulties as an inevitable outgrowth of the foundations of what they see as a capitalistic, racist society. Their remedy, therefore, is to change these foundations. Hal Draper, a leader in the Free Speech Movement (FSM) at the University of California at Berkeley outlined very well the differences between the liberal left and the New Left.

> The central core of the working ideology of the typical radical activists is not defined by any one issue, but consists of a choice between two alternative modes of operation: <u>permeation</u> or <u>left opposition</u>. The former seeks to adapt to the ruling powers and

> infiltrate their centers of influence with the aim of (some day) getting to the very levers of decision-making--becoming part of the Establishment in order to manipulate the reins to the left. The latter wish to stand outside the Establishment as an open opposition, achieving even short-term changes by the pressure of a bold alternative, while seeking roads to fundamental transformations.[5]

A similar distinction has been made by Kelman who describes these two factions as the "Cans" and the "Can'ts." The "Cans" are similar to the "permeationists" who generally accept the "system" as legitimate and try to change it, while the "left opposition" or "Can'ts" seek replacement of the existing order.[6]

The "permeationist" group would be supporters of a McCarthy-Kennedy movement, while the New Left would not generally support such a program. In fact, they may actually be opposed to it. They reason that such activity siphons off potential support they would like to be able to reach or "radicalize." Some go so far as to imply that there was collusion between the liberal-left and the Democratic Administration. A handout several days before the 1968 election produced by Boston Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) proclaimed:

> McCarthy's main goal was to divert students from taking a militant stand for immediate withdrawal and to reinforce the illusion that the only way to change things is by voting. We say the only way people have ever won better conditions is by organizing, making demands, and backing those demands up by direct action--strikes, sit-ins, demonstrations, etc.[7]

The differences described above are crucial and often overlooked or misunderstood.

Individuals who consider themselves conscientious objectors may be involved in the New Left politics, although many of them are not. This type of protest is actually not new, but is a very traditional, individualistic form of protest. It may be that the more traditional conscientious objectors who are opposed to all wars, frequently on religious grounds, are the individuals who are less likely to be involved in radical politics.

Currently, however, many individuals consider themselves to be "selective conscientious objectors;" that is against the war in Vietnam but not unwilling to fight in all wars. The current resistance to the military service is frequently an effort to avoid compliance with the Establishment.

It is difficult to include the black power movement within the context of this paper because although most of the movement's leaders come from young people, they are almost all persons who do not meet our restricted definition of youth. However, as many of the movement's participants are in the age group from 15 to 21 and as it is likely to be a significant force in American life for a long time I feel that it is worthwhile considering here.

Placing black power organizations on a political continuum is difficult since there has been an increase in the number of these organizations in recent years and their goals change from time to time in response to changes in leadership within the groups, the mood within the Negro community, and changes in political circumstances within the United States. In addition, these organizations, both black and white, are not as monolithic and cohesive on a national level as people believe (or, probably, as persons within the organization would like people to believe). The Boston chapter of the Urban League, for example, appears to be considerably more militant than the national organization. Finally, many of the current demands of the more militant separatist leaders, sound curiously similar to those which have traditionally been advocated by white, racist groups. However, some generalizations can be made about various organizations and their positions.

The National Association of Colored People (NAACP); the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC); and the Urban League all represent what in today's context must be viewed as rather traditional civil rights organizations. They are traditional in that their goals are integrationist, they include many white people in their organizations and they generally deal less in what has become known as "confrontation politics;" sit-ins,

demonstrations, ultimatums, etc. The exception is the SCLC which in the past used this type of tactic extensively under the leadership of the late Martin Luther King. The goals of the SCLC, however, have clearly been integrationist. It appears that within each of these organizations there is a faction which is attempting to make them more militant. At least this is the case if their recent national conventions are any sort of indication.

The NAACP has frequently specialized in the use of the courts in advancing their aims and the Urban League has concentrated its efforts in job training and job placement; both efforts obviously need the cooperation of the white community and presuppose the good will of at least some segments of that community. This trust, as well as the traditional tactics of these two organizations may account, at least in part, for the fact that there is little enthusiasm for them on the part of many young black people. Roy Wilkins of the NAACP admitted recently that his organization had little contact with young black people. He has announced his ambition to make a greater appeal to them.

> We are anxious to get hold of the imagination, the youthfulness, the fearlessness of the young people...We are beginning a new thrust of additional services to the urban ghetto and an appeal to the young people. We are going after high school youngsters and—despite the present theory of Black separatism on some campuses—we are trying to expand our college chapters.8/

The Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) are the best known black power organizations and must be viewed currently as being distinctly different from the three traditional organizations discussed above. CORE, according to the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (the Kerner Report), was founded in 1947 as a liberal integrationist organization but did not gain prominence until January 1961 when James Farmer became the national director.9/ Since that time their history has been one of increasing militancy until they are now an organization with fairly militant aims. Much of their current

push is for the development of all Negro businesses or "black capitalism." SNCC was initiated by Martin Luther King in April 1960. However, after about a year the young members of the group considered him too cautious and broke with him. SNCC in particular has been attractive to both white and black youth because of its activist leanings and militancy, although it is now virtually an all black organization.

In discussing organization differences the National Advisory Commission states:

> CORE was the most interracial. SCLC appeared to be the most deliberate. SNCC staff workers lived on subsistence allowances and seemed to regard going to jail as a way of life. The NAACP continued the most varied programs, retaining a strong emphasis on court litigation, maintaining a highly effective lobby at the national capital, and engaging in direct-action campaigns. The National Urban League, under the leadership of Whitney M. Young, Jr., appointed executive director in 1961, became more outspoken and talked more firmly to businessmen who had previously been treated with utmost tact and caution.[10]

More recently the Afro-American clubs on college campuses have emphasized the positive aspects of black identity and made demands for more black students, black faculty and black history courses and black majors. The Black Panthers are a newer organization and are located mainly within big-city ghettoes. Very militant in tone, often armed, they have small membership roles (estimated between 1,000 and 5,000), they talk of far reaching, fundamental political change brought about by vague, disagreed upon means.[11] However, their emphasis upon their "blackness" and their constant presence may act as visible evidence to document the failure of the American melting pot ideal. In addition, it appears that they are playing a part in establishing a "black identity" which may help offset the long standing psychological self-hatred among blacks. Although Eldridge Cleaver, Minister of Information of the Black Panther party, states that he has some hope for working with young, sympathetic white people his organization is now all black. Afro-American clubs, SNCC, CORE, and the Black Panthers appear to have the greatest following among black youth.

SDS is an almost entirely white organization of about 70,000 members.[12] Organized in June 1962 as a liberal student organization it has followed a course similar to SNCC and CORE in that it has become increasingly militant until it now has goals ranging from campus and educational reform to changes in the nature of American political institutions. This organization, like the black power groups, suffers a great deal of internal unrest, confusion, and disagreement over goals and tactics. It is the most radical of the white, young, political groups.[13] [13a]

With the exception of a faction within SDS which is affiliated with the Maoist Progressive Labor party,[14] an alliance which is more ideological than it is practical, none of these organizations truly ally itself with international movements.[15] SDS, for example, scorns the American Communist Party as a group of misfit individuals who are now harmless caricatures of a truly revolutionary party. This sort of "selling out" incidentally, is something which they guard against zealously, and they regard it as imperative not to become too closely affiliated with an "Establishment" organization. The Peace Corps, for example, is regarded by many of the New Left as a "tool of American foreign policy" and something which they would not allow themselves to be contaminated by. This would not be true of most Kennedy-McCarthy followers who would be much more apt to become a part of such a program.

One of the reasons why people often fear that New Leftists are "Communist dupes" or misled by Communists is because their avowed heroes are often people who have been associated with other countries and Communist movements. They include Marx, Lenin, Trotsky, Mao, Che Guevara and, in this country, Malcolm X, Eldridge Cleaver and Tom Hayden, the nominal student leader. It is significant, I think, that with the exception of Mao their heroes are mostly people who led revolutions or wrote about them, and not the administrators and bureaucrats of revolutionary movements. Their

ideal is the strong willed, uncompromising revolutionary. This is reflected in the style of their own organizations and accounts for the unwieldy and decentralized nature of much of their activity.

It is my feeling that the McCarthy-Kennedy supporters, the New Left and the Black Power movement represent the most significant political behavior among young people and the rest of this report will concentrate on the various aspects of these movements. Not included in this discussion are those persons known as Yippies, or members of the Youth International Party. This is because this organization is actually anti-political and consists of young people who are politically withdrawn, not activists. They will be discussed in a later paper.

B. PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS

The investigations of the psychological characteristics of the political activities of youth are very uneven. There are many studies of the New Left--white, college enrolled youth and few of anyone else. This, as one might suspect, is due to the fact that the latter group is readily available for study by the social scientists at the colleges they attend. I was able to find no comparable material discussing black, non-college youth.

The most comprehensive, best known work has been done by Kenneth Keniston,16/ a psychologist at Yale Medical School. This recently published book, the Young Radicals, has the most complete bibliography on the published material available. Many other behavioral scientists have also done research on these young people. A number of generalizations can be made based upon these and other investigations.

These young people, mostly college students, attend the most select universities in the country and have consistently achieved well in their academic careers. Frequently they have felt different from their peers,

often in a positive, superior sense. Keniston quotes one young man involved in Vietnam Summer in Cambridge, a 1967 national effort to organize a summer-long protest against the war in Vietnam:

> I grew up very sort of estranged from the other people around. My parents were also very, very concerned with intellectual work, and that's not a good way to be in an American community...So that I developed a set of values that was very antagonistic to those of the kids around. You know, that didn't help at all either. Some of these were really good values, but I don't think all of them were, by a long shot. I didn't really get unisolated until I was in high school, late in high school.[17]

Most of them have warm, close relationships with their parents, a finding which contradicts the theory that they are simply acting-out their opposition to parental strictness in their political activism. In addition, again refuting a popular theory, they do not have parents who are ex-radicals from the 1930's who have settled down to a conservative political outlook.

Richard Flacks, a sociologist at the University of Chicago notes:

> Data collected in a study of student activists and their parents and in a study of participants and nonparticipants in a large scale campus revolt, support the view that activists' parents are affluent and highly educated, and extremely liberal in their politics. They tend to transmit to their offspring values and life styles which emphasize intellectual, aesthetic and humanitarian concerns and de-emphasize occupational and material achievement.[18]

These are introspective young people who are very sensitive to their own feelings. They are looking for meaning in their own lives and are more preoccupied with this concern than they are afraid of becoming like their parents, according to Professor Michael Walzer of Harvard.[19] Their political activities are a way of finding that meaning and in this they differ greatly from those young people who turn to individual, aesthetic pursuits such as the creative arts and differ also from those who turn to escapist adventures with the use of drugs. That these young activists are seeking traditional political goals as well as a way of finding meaning in their own lives is well demonstrated by a poster displayed by Harvard students during their protests.

> Strike for the eight demands, Strike because you hate Cops, Strike because your roommate was clubbed, Strike to stop expansion, Strike to seize control of your life, Strike to become more human, Strike to return Paine Hall scholarships, Strike because there's no poetry in your lectures, Strike because classes are a bore, Strike for power, Strike to smash the Corporation, Strike to make yourself free, Strike to abolish ROTC, Strike because they are trying to squeeze the life out of you, Strike [20]

Frequently the term alienated has been applied to them because of their intense dislike of many of the values of our society. Although this term may be accurate in a general way, they are very different from those young people who might agree with the goals of activists, but turn their feelings inward and engage in what Keniston describes as privatism. Keniston's subjects who engaged in privatism and who were not engaged in political involvement differ from activists in that they distrusted commitment; were pessimistic about the future; engaged in self-contempt; and were passive and highly individualistic in their behavior.[21]

Earlier I indicated that the young activists received good grades and were intelligent. One observation of them that has been made frequently is that they are anti-intellectual in that they grossly oversimplify the issues involved in the struggles in which they become participants. This is a contradiction found within the people who are in the movement and is not simply a conscious effort to win support by oversimplifying; from all appearances they believe just what they say. Apparently the strength of their feelings on issues results in their taking positions in a manner which is not consistent with their general approach to life. Perhaps much of this is a reaction on their part against what they see as excessive "objectivity" and lack of passion within the classroom and among the people around them. This style of the New Left, great passion and revolutionary rhetoric as a means toward their ends has great importance in the movement. However, they continue to have an intellectual outlook in much of their life activities

and would probably turn to academic life and graduate work if they became disenchanted with political activities. They are not good recruiting material for societal dropouts, or "hippies."

C. RECENT HISTORY OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

There is no official, agreed-upon date for the beginnings of the current activism among the youth. There are, however, several events which appear to be of great significance in the development of activities among white and black youth. These movements have separate beginnings; a period of several years of joint activities; and, in the last several years, have been functioning fairly separately.

1. Civil Rights and the South

The 1950's was a period of slowly increasing militancy among the black people of this country generally, especially in the South under the leadership of Martin Luther King. King and the Supreme Court decision of 1954 which legally put an end to segregated schools brought very slow but continuing changes in the South. The first well publicized youth-led resistance came in February 1960 when several Negro students from Greensboro, North Carolina sat-in at a segregated lunch counter, demanding to be served.[22/] This incident triggered a series of events throughout the South involving civil disobedience, freedom rides, arrests and court cases. This movement, which was started by black youths, brought a response from white college students, almost all from the North, who spent several summers in various states in the deep South working for political organization and voter registration. These events were capped by the summer of 1964, known as Mississippi Summer, which saw thousands of college students involved in such organizing in the South. Mississippi Summer provided a unique opportunity for leadership training among white and black youths who were confronted with bigotry, abject poverty and a corrupt political power structure. Many of them were shocked to learn that it was impossible for some citizens to vote in the United

States. In the language of the SDS it had a "radicalizing" effect on many of them and created a new militancy and dedication.

A young person, discussing this process, tells Keniston:

> That process is one of frustration: frustration with societal institutions and in particular those institutions providing for the change of society, such as electoral politics. When these institutions fail them, those who want to change are, by definition, radicalized in the sense that they now know that more radical action must be taken to accomplish their goals.23/

A number of the students who were later to become involved in campus protests received their initiation into political activities in the South. Among these was Mario Savio, leader of the Free Speech Movement in Berkeley. Thus, the early part of the civil rights movement was a racially integrated one. A brief history of the black organizations in presented earlier in this paper.

2. Campus Protests

The student political movement on the campus had early stirrings in 1960 at the University of California at Berkeley. There, during May of that year a number of students demonstrated and were arrested at hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee in nearby San Francisco. The series of events there--student taunts, police reprisals, arrests, public controversy, increased militancy on the part of the students and cries of "subversion" in the Congress and among the public--are a prototype of the student protests which have followed.

Most people date the current movement with the activities on the Berkeley campus as starting during the fall of 1964. These controversies centered around the collection of money on-campus for organizations with nationally based activities and with limitations placed on this fund raising in certain parts of the college campus.24/ These protests, the arrests of 800 students and the national publicity which resulted started a series of protests which have expanded greatly from the original complaints. These include: the "relevance" of the college curriculum; ROTC on campus; college

relations with the nearby community; college relations with the CIA and the Defense Department; the number of black students and black faculty on campus; the addition of courses on black history; the demand for greater student voice in decisions affecting them; demands for less restrictions regarding living arrangements on or near the campus. Besides the internal campus issues just mentioned, there are issues of greater magnitude external to the campus which are very much related to these controversies.

While everyone agrees that these broader issues play a part in this discontent, no one knows to what extent or in exactly what way. The overriding issue is the war in Vietnam and the student frustration at its continuance. Another major contributing factor is the difficulties the civil rights movement has been experiencing the last several years and the widespread disappointment that the passage of such bills as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 did not bring the widespread, immediate results that people had hoped for. These bills, along with the failures of a war on poverty that never really got off the ground have resulted in widespread cynicism, or at least skepticism, among those young people who consider themselves members of the New Left or, at least, activists. In addition, the assassinations of Malcolm X, Medgar Evers, John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy appear to have added to the feeling of futility and impotence. To the New Left they are stark examples of the failure of the American system of government to effectively respond to crises. Among many white youth it has led to call for radical action, while among some young blacks it has engendered separatist sympathies.

3. Black Separatism

Malcolm X preached a doctrine of separatism in the early 1960's and, of course, the idea is not new in American history. According to the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders,[25/] the current black power movement had its beginning in 1966 with the Meredith March from Memphis to

Jackson, Mississippi. This date also marked the beginning of the widespread publicity, if not widespread acceptance, of the idea of separatism. This has brought about a splitting of the New Left and the civil rights movement. In retrospect it appears that this may have been inevitable. The background of the individuals within these groups is so different: the white New Left, upper-middle class, affluent, children of politically sophisticated parents are rejecting what the black youth have never had. Thus, their goals are quite dissimilar. The black youth are active in seeking redress of grievances they are experiencing personally and continually, while the New Left members are involved in a somewhat altruistic, freely chosen, probably temporary avocation. A black student at the City College of New York was recently quoted:

> The white radical groups do not realize that their goals are different than ours...They're fighting a system that they're part of—they're fighting from the inside out. We're on the outside. We're fighting something we were never part of. We cannot drop in and out of the system at will.[26]

The potential constituency of the New Left are their fellow college students, while the black youth must appeal to families within the ghetto. It is perhaps unrealistic to expect that a member from one movement could effectively campaign so completely out of his element. Successful organizing among poor people would inevitably result in capitalizing on their numbers to form large unions and pressure groups; the very impersonal nature of which is antithetical to the New Left.[27] It does not fit in with the style of the New Left, whose major focus is on <u>means</u> and style rather than <u>ends</u>, to doggedly engage in such mundane, long-term projects such as voter registration and grass roots community organizing.

D. GOALS OF VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

The goals of the major groups of young people active today varies considerably. I will consider the goals of the New Left and the black power advocates as their aims are the less traditional and understandable than the less militant McCarthy-Kennedy supporters.

1. The New Left

The New Left purposely avoid long-range planning and bureaucratization of their organizations to reach specific goals. In fact, it is this sort of machinery, which they feel is dehumanizing and degrading, which they are trying to change in our society. The more conservative members of the SDS appear to have as their goals the liberalization of campus rules, an end to the war in Vietnam and equal treatment for the black man in America. The more radical members state ambitions to alter what they feel are the foundations of our society which have created these conditions. Stated simply, they feel that the country is racist and imperialistic and that there is an alliance between the defense contractors, Defense Department, government at all levels and labor unions to continue the capitalistic system generally and the Vietnamese War specifically to maintain a system which is to their personal benefit. Generally, they feel that the change should be in a socialistic direction, although they deeply fear the bureaucratic structure and stagnation which might inevitably develop from such a change. Thus they see constant change, both personally and governmentally, as a way of avoiding that stagnation. They feel that large institutions--whether business, government or labor--have prevented men from being free to realize their potential. In Keniston's words:

> Their aim, for themselves and for others, is a world where men can grow and develop, each at his own rate and in his own way, where people have learned to "be people," where each man can "do his thing."

Keniston lists a number of areas in which the New Leftist feels that changes should be made.

a. They seek a new orientation to the future, one that avoids the fixed tasks and defined lifeworks of the past in favor of an openness and acceptance of flux and uncertainty.

.....

b. They seek new pathways of personal development wherein the openness of youth, its fluidity, growth, and change, its responsiveness to inner life and historical need, can be maintained throughout life.

.....

c. They seek new values for living, values that will fill the spiritual emptiness created by material affluence.

.....

d. They seek new styles of human interaction from which the participants grow in dignity and strength.

.....

e. They seek new ways of knowing, ways that combine intense personal conviction with relevance and enduring accuracy to the facts.

.....

f. They seek new kinds of learning, learning that maximizes the involvement of the intellect in the individual's experience, instead of divorcing the two.

.....

g. They seek new concepts of man in society, concepts that acknowledge the unique individuality of each human being without denying man's social embeddedness, that stress social involvement without neglecting the special potential that is often covered by social role.

.....

h. They seek new formulations of the world, formulations that give adequate weight to the movement and change that is ubiquitous in their experience.

.....

i. They seek new types of social organization, institutional forms that include rather than exclude.

.....

j. They seek new tactics of political action that increase the awareness of those who take part in them and of those whom they affect.

.....

k. They seek new patterns of international relations, patterns within which men of diverse nations can respect both their common humanity and their cultural uniqueness.

.....

l. Perhaps most important, they seek new controls on violence, whether between man and man or between nation and nation. Clearly, their goals relate to traditional demands for change to better realize the unfulfilled American dream, as well as a personal quest for meaningfulness.[28]

.....

2. Black Power

The goals of black power advocates range from believing in the use of political organizations to gain leverage to enter the full-stream of American society in a manner similar to various ethnic groups who have migrated to this country to plans for complete separation from the white race by relocating black people in one geographic area within the United States.

Stokely Carmichael, a young man in his twenties who is the former head of SNCC, and Floyd McKissick, until recently the director of CORE, appear to be fairly representative of the militant mood in the ghetto. These men, as well as other militant spokesmen, are usually given only brief mass media exposure which tends to make their demands and plans appear more radical and chaotic than they really are.

Carmichael writes:

> We want to see money go back into the community and used to benefit it. We want to see the co-operative concept applied in business and banking. We want to see black ghetto residents demand that an exploiting landlord or store keeper sell them, at minimal cost, a building or a shop that they will own and improve co-operatively; they can back their demand with a rent strike, or a boycott, and a community so unified behind them that no one else will move into the building or buy at the store. The society we seek to build among black people, then, is not a capitalist one. It is a society in which the spirit of community and humanistic love prevail.29/

Carmichael also indicates that he is not saying that white people can not work with blacks in this endeavor, but that for once, it must be the black people who make the decision whether or not to accept a particular offer of help.

McKissick lists six areas in which he states progress must be made:

1. The growth of Black <u>political</u> power.
2. The building of Black <u>economic</u> power.
3. The improvement of the <u>self-image</u> of Black people.
4. The development of Black <u>leadership</u>.
5. The attainment of <u>Federal law enforcement</u>.
6. The mobilization of Black <u>consumer</u> power.30/

E. TACTICS OF DIFFERENT POLITICAL GROUPS

1. General

The tactics of these groups vary considerably. In a sense, the McCarthy-Kennedy groups represent an old-style conventional political campaign, albeit on a dramatic, mass scale. Much of their work was old fashioned, door-to-door precinct work. It was, however, the first time that it was ever done on such a widespread scale. The New Left must be more calculating in their use of political techniques since their support is not nearly so widespread as Senator McCarthy's or Senator Kennedy's was. They must rely on their opposition to make errors which will mobilize their latent support. Much of the New Left approach has been called the "politics of confrontation;" dramatic, public, head-on challenges of the Establishment.

At this point it might be appropriate to comment on a New Left tactic which has cost them the support of much of the adult liberal community. They have considerably extended the concept of civil disobedience--publicly breaking a law which is felt to be unjust in order to have it changed--by violating laws which, while they are not unjust, are felt to be symbols of things that are unjust. For example, although no one seriously questions laws against breaking and entering, if students are "occupying" a college president's office and if he has a part in the college obtaining federal research funds for activities relating to defense contracts, they say they are <u>really</u> demonstrating against corruption of which the college president happens to be a representative. If that does not satisfy their detractors the students point out that their law breaking and destruction of property is negligible compared to the war in Vietnam, racism and poverty. Needless to say, this remains a chief area of criticism of the New Left by liberal faculty members and other adults who might be generally sympathetic to their cause.

In the eyes of the New Left or black power advocates, the United States condition is so bad, American society so irredeemable by conventional means that radical action is necessary. Mario Savio, the FSM leader in Berkeley speaking just before the sit-in of the university administration building, sums up this position most eloquently:

> There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, you can't even tacitly take part. And you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus, and you've got to make it stop. And you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free, the machine will be prevented from working at all.[21]

John Searle, a professor of philosophy at the University of California, Berkeley, was actively involved in the FSM, initially as an advocate of the students and later as an advisor to the administration of the university. He has described the process which occurs on campuses in conflict. He states that the initial student complaint must be related to a "sacred topic," which may be "the First Amendment, race and the war in Vietnam--in that order..." The students then make demands on the administration which cannot be met. When the administration refuses to comply the students break a number of campus rules which are met with reprisals by the university and the police may be called. This "proves" that the college administration is really a part of the whole organization of repression throughout the world and results in a great deal more support from students and faculty and makes the issue much more localized. As the mass media moves in the issues harden and charges are thrown about by both sides. As the student support grows the list of grievances likewise grows and typically include the following:

> The president must be fired (he usually is, in fact).
> There must be amnesty for all.
> The university must be restructured so as to give the students a major share in all decision-making.

> The administration has to be abolished, or at any rate confined to sweeping sidewalks and such.
> The university must cease all cooperation with the Defense Department, and other official agencies in the outside community.
> Capitalism must end—now.
> Society must be reorganized.[32]

2. Tactics--Two Case Examples

In Massachusetts there have been a number of campus disruptions. Two such conflicts, similar in some respects and very dissimilar in others, are worth examining in some detail in order to better understand such upsets. The first involved a sit-in by about 65 black students at Brandeis University from January 8 to January 18, 1969. The major issue revolved around the demand of the black students to have autonomy in the establishment of an Afro-American and African studies department with students being given the right to employ and dismiss faculty.[33] The second incident to be discussed took place at Harvard University cn April 9, 1969 when University Hall was occupied and the following day 184 were arrested.[34] The immediate controversy in this conflict centered around the continuance of ROTC at Harvard. At Brandeis University there was relative calm and cohesion during and after the controversy, while at Harvard there was major internal strife among students, faculty and administration. To obtain a better understanding of this difference it is helpful to briefly examine the characteristics of these two schools.

In some important respects, Harvard and Brandeis are similar institutions. Both are extremely select, prestigious institutions. Both have a history of liberalism in their handling of students and both schools have a generally permissive atmosphere. Unlike earlier conflicts, such as the Berkeley FSM, the issues did not revolve around the impersonality and uncaring quality of the university. A Harvard undergraduate writes:

> Students are simply not treated like numbers and contacts with the faculty and deans are theirs for the asking. The quality of life, given New England weather, is fine; living accommodations are a suite of rooms with fireplace and private bath, and attendance at class is not compulsory.[35]

Brandeis, with a student body of 2,600 is likewise not viewed as an unresponsive institution. The schools are also similar in that both student bodies have within them organizations of militant students. The two schools contain many moderate leftist leaning students who would be potentially sympathetic to the demands of militant groups.

At neither Harvard nor Brandeis was there a great degree of initial support for the protesting students. Just before the building takeover at Harvard,

> ...the crowd's shock soon turned to hostility, SDS speakers were jeered and booed. When one SDS spokesman was foolish enough to let all those present have a voice vote of support or opposition to the takeover, SDS was resoundingly defeated.[36]

At Brandeis the Student Council, opposed the building seizure by a vote of 13-0-2 and asked the black students to leave Ford Hall (administration building). They also urged President Abram not to use force.[37] Efforts by white militants at Brandeis to organize a strike in support of the black students resulted in only about 200 participants. After ten days the black students vacated the building, their demands unmet. An important reason appeared to be the astute handling by President Abram who did not react in such a way as to present the students with an immediate issue around which to organize.

At Harvard there was major disruption of academic life for several weeks, and 184 arrests, while at Brandeis school remained open. It appears that the difference centers around two major participants: the college presidents involved and the behavior of the students within the occupied buildings.

President Morris Abram of Brandeis took pains to be available to the protesting students. Soon after the building takeover he said: "I have stated my willingness and readiness to hear them now and when they leave. I would be prepared to negotiate any grievance they might have."[38] At the same time he did not act unilaterally without consulting students and faculty. During his first visit with the protesting students he commented, "I am not here to negotiate except under the faculty recommendation."[39] The faculty were

consulted concerning negotiations and took part in the talks with the black students. During the discussions the faculty voted 207 to 12 with 17 abstentions to support President Abram's "vigorous and judicious efforts" to resolve the difficulty.[40]

President Pusey issued a reply through the Harvard University News Office. It began, "Can anyone believe that the Harvard SDS demands are made seriously?" He then systematically answered the charges of the students including alleged efforts by the administration to thwart a faculty decision regarding ROTC; the question of financial aid to students under probation; the issue of ROTC scholarships; the question of the rents charged for University-owned apartments; and the conflict regarding expansion of Harvard in the surrounding community. His news release ended, "How can one respond to allegations which have no basis in fact?"[41] The afternoon of the takeover, according to the Harvard Alumni Magazine,

> ...Dean Glimp (Fred L. Glimp, Dean of the College) had begun meeting with a coalition of moderate students from the Harvard Undergraduate Council, the Student-Faculty Advisory Council, and the Harvard-Radcliffe Policy Committee. They had discussed ways of handling the situation, and the students had urged that the police not be called; if there should be a police action, they asked that it be taken in daylight, be accompanied by University officers, and be essentially non-violent. The coalition was to convene an open meeting at ten the next morning to continue discussion.
>
> Dean Glimp had made unsuccessful attempts to talk with the demonstrators, and early in the evening a moderate student urged him to make one more. A message was taken to University Hall, where another mass meeting was beginning. The Glimp initiative was discussed, and voted down. That was shortly before ten o'clock. Not much later, President Pusey made the final decision to send in police at daybreak.[42]

The police action resulted in 48 people being treated for injuries, including 34 Harvard or Radcliffe students and five policemen. The political result was an activation of perhaps a majority of the Harvard students who voted to strike in protest over the decision to call in the police. The SDS made attempts to convince the students that they should protest not only the police

action but the demands mentioned above. As happens in most campus upheavals, the issues proliferated and became more diffuse as days and meetings passed.

An important element in the discord of the universities is the behavior of students while occupying the buildings. At Harvard, confidential files were broken into and letters were published from these files in the Old Mole, a Boston weekly radical publication. This made it more difficult for the administration to postpone any police action. The Brandeis students, in contrast, took meticulous care of the building they occupied and requested an inspection of it by university officials to insure that no damage had been done.

What these two incidents illustrate is the almost impossible situation in which college presidents find themselves. They must be responsive to the students and faculty who generally take a liberal position, and at the same time answer to trustees, regents, alumni and in the case of public institutions, legislatures, who take a conservative stance. President Abram of Brandeis is generally praised as one of the few individuals who has, at least to date, been able to serve a divided constituency very skillfully. That others have not been so successful is evidenced by the fact that 80 to 100 four year colleges are looking for new presidents.[43]

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF YOUTH IN POLITICS

The effect that young people have had on the political scene in American life in the last few years has been undeniable. The New Left has forced a re-evaluation of university education on many campuses which has resulted in the students playing a much more important role in the decisions which affect their lives on the campus. As a result there has been a general relaxation of many of the rules regulating the lives of undergraduates. This has occurred not only at the publicized universities which have had major disruptions, but

the quieter campuses as well. A survey of 42 campuses across the country by the New York Times in the Spring of 1969 revealed that changes had occurred in the following areas:

> Black studies programs and increased effort to recruit Negroes and other minority groups.
> Campus regulations, particularly dormitory hours and women's curfews.
> The presence of the Reserve Officer Training Corps program.
> Curriculum changes, and reforms in departmental structure.
> Nonscholastic issues, such as the university's expansion into neighboring low-income areas.[44]

Other changes in school policies include the addition of students on the board of trustees of universities; hiring of faculty and administrators; and the discontinuance of secret, Defense Department related research.[45]

Many feel that the activities of the McCarthy supporters played a large part in President Johnson's decision not to run for re-election by presenting tangible evidence of his unpopularity. The behavior of youth at Columbia University during the spring of 1968 and in Chicago during the Democratic Convention brought about reprisals by the police which, in turn, resulted in official reports which were seriously critical of police behavior. A police inspector from the Los Angeles Police Department, who was present during the Convention, reported:

> There is no question but that many officers acted without restraint and exerted force beyond that necessary under the circumstances. The leadership at the point of conflict did little to prevent such conduct and the direct control of officers by first line supervisors was virtually non-existent.[46]

The Summary of the report concluded:

> Police violence was a fact of convention week. Were the policemen who committed it a minority? It appears certain that they were--but one which has imposed some of the consequences of its actions on the majority, and certain on their commanders. There has been no public condemnation of these violators of sound police procedures and common decency by either their commanding officers or city officials. Nor (at the time this Report is being completed--almost three months after the convention) has any disciplinary action been taken against most of them.[47]

This may have long-range effects on police training, recruitment and, in the case of Chicago particularly, many believe that it had a significant political effect at a national level.

The report of the Commission assigned to investigate the Columbia disturbances were critical of the insensitivity of the University to the needs of its students. They were also critical of police conduct.

> "...The police engaged in acts of individual and group brutality for which a layman can see no justification unless it be that the way to restore order in a riot is to terrorize civilians. Dean Platt (Associate Dean for Student Affairs) testified that when he pointed out to two police officers the brutal charge of plainclothes men in front of Furnald Hall, the officers replied that they could see no policemen. Second, some students attacked the police and otherwise provoked the retaliation. Their fault was in no way commensurate with the brutality of the police and, for the most part, was its consequence. But some students' conduct shocked and repelled even some of the radicals who had occupied the buildings during April 23-30."[48]

A conclusion of the report was that immediate means must be found to meaningfully involve the students in a way that they could influence the education being offered them and so that they could also have some say over the other aspects of university life.[49]

Still another influence young people have had is reflected in the White House. Richard Nixon has a number of aides who are in their late twenties, and this may well reflect some concern over the influence and future voting behavior of young people. Nixon, in addition, is advocating lowering the voting age and has proposed a youth service agency to bring together the many departments now serving young people.[50] A number of states have made moves recently to lower the voting age.

Controversy over the selective service system in this country has increased markedly in recent years; at least partially in response to the continued protests of young persons over the inequities of the draft. Nixon has proposed a plan to eliminate some of these inequities as have a number of Senators.

The radical behavior of some young persons has brought about a crisis in the nation, on the college campuses and within individuals. Many persons who have considered themselves liberal for years are uncomfortable with a vocal minority to their political left. A crisis inevitably calls into question the traditional answers and assumptions. As a result a rethinking of political positions and a re-examination of beliefs has created new alliances and antagonisms. An example is the current President of San Francisco State College, S. I. Hayakawa, long considered a liberal and a renowned expert in communications. However, after having been President for only a short time,

> He embarked immediately on a program that brought the police to the campus to break up student disruptions. This resulted in some use of Chemical Mace and one confrontation where the police met students with drawn guns...
>
> The acting president, although a world renowned expert on the science of communicating between persons, has been caught in controversial statements several times.
>
> 'This has been the most exciting day since my 10th birthday, when I rode a roller coaster for the first time,' he said, in describing a day when the police beat many students with clubs.
>
> There was another instance when he walked off a news program on KZED, the educational station here, after accusing the reporters of undercutting his position.
>
> Dr. Hayakawa also antagonized the faculty when he accepted his acting presidency without consulting his colleagues. The faculty has a standing committee to locate a president for the school, and the semanticist was a member of it.
>
> Further, faculty liberals were upset by Dr. Hayakawa's summary suspensions of student demonstrators and his talk of dismissing faculty members who failed to hold classes because of the strike.[21]

In addition to the above effects young activists have brought about a reaction which many of them had not anticipated. Many feel that they have created a resentment on the part of many Americans which has been utilized by conservatives such as Ronald Reagan and George Wallace in gathering votes. It has also resulted in budget difficulties in various states in regard to higher educational programs. Some New Leftists see this as an advantage and, in fact, have urged voters to cast their ballots for conservatives as they feel that only by "exposing" the populace to these administrations will they be able to "radicalize" many more individuals. There is little support outside the New Left for such theorizing.

The protests of the militant young appear to have had a significant effect on their inactive peers. It may be that activities which until recently were almost unthinkable among college age youth have created a range of alternatives to many young people which they did not feel was available previously. If taking over a building is unacceptable behavior, as it clearly is to most young people, perhaps picketing is rather tame and permissible in its presence. It also appears that the militants have provoked a reaction from the establishment which has dismayed many non-activist young people. Although it is far short of the "radicalization" process so desired by the SDS, it may at least have a "liberalization" effect. A Gallup Survey indicated that 28% of college students had "participated in a demonstration of some kind," and that 81% of the students questioned felt they should have a greater voice in the operation of the college.[52/] A recent poll conducted for C.B.S. revealed that, although only 1% of college young people consider themselves to be radicals, 37% of the respondents considered themselves "moderate reformers."[53/] Forty-eight percent of the college students "sympathize with goals of radicals," which accounts for much of the success of the militants thus far. It is this latent support which the SDS has frequently been able to mobilize on the university campuses. If this sympathy with radical change continues among such a large percentage of college age youth, the effects on the political life in this country in the future will be great indeed.

The young black power advocates have had minimal gains in the traditional political sense. Most of the recent gains, notably by Carl Stokes of Cleveland, Ohio, and Richard Hatcher in Gary, Indiana, among black people have been made by relatively traditional political organizations. It may be that the more radical behavior of some black power groups has made more acceptable moderate black groups and thus helped legitimize the candidacy of men like Stokes and Hatcher. The young militants, also, have created an atmosphere which is likely to have a

lasting effect on ghetto politics. They have started to create a new pride in being black which has been lacking in their communities for so long. Also, according to Roy Wilkins of the NAACP:

> The black militant—so-called, deserves the thanks of all Negro Americans for bringing the race issue out of the political closets and stirring up the apathy of the Negroes and the white majority. They have made racism the No. 1 issue in America.
>
> They have gotten the issue into every newspaper, magazine, radio and television program; they have gotten it into the Broadway stage, into the movies; they have gotten it into the curriculum and the text-books and have confronted politicians, educators and religious leaders with the fact of racism.54/

Ultimately it may be that the greatest effect made by these young people is on the conscience of America. They have pointed to much of what is ugly in this country: racism, poverty, hypocrisy and inequality at all levels through our society. Keniston says that much of what these young people demand so strenuously, if taken literally, is actually conservative, although the means to reach these goals may be radical. SDS talks of "participatory democracy," meaning greater reliance on local government, smaller national government and more community participation. Black power groups speak of a need for "black capitalism" and self-determination, ideas which are not so radical on close examination and when much of the rhetoric is stripped away.

G. FUTURE OF YOUTH IN POLITICS

Predicting the future behavior of human beings is always risky. It is even more precarious to predict the future behavior of young persons. One thing of which most observers are now convinced is that political action on the part of young people is likely to continue to be important for some time. Talk by some that the McCarthy campaign represented for young people the "last chance for the system" appears to be misinformed. Few of those youthful campaigners are likely to "drop out" as a result of the political frustrations they have encountered, although they may become less active politically. Political behavior for them is the exception rather than the rule. It does appear that should an attractive,

liberal candidate of either party be nominated for national public office, these young people or others like them are likely to become active again. There are efforts currently underway to organize and make permanent the current discontent among the McCarthy-Kennedy activists who feel very unhappy with the current Establishment politics and are equally uncomfortable with the New Left style of politics.[55/]

The New Left, of course, has a greater commitment to their ends. But if they are to continue to be an influence in American life they must recruit greater numbers. There is almost no one in this country to their political left; certainly not the old-time socialists who are small in number and who have little taste for the style of the New Left. Their most fertile potential ground for recruitment is to their immediate right: college professors, intellectuals generally, and their fellow college students. However, Walzer suggests that the more they engage in the "politics of confrontation" and gain relatively small, political victories the more they alienate the broad base they need for a mass movement.[56/] There is some evidence that the reaction at City College of New York, a college campus experiencing political ferment since the 1930's, is one of anger and resentment among many non-SDS members. This fall a group of SDS students forced their way into the office of an associate dean and stole confidential files from the office. This was reacted to by a number of students as "dumb," "insane" or "worthless." "What clearly has happened is they've overdone it," said the chairman of the philosophy department, Prof. Julius A. Elias. "They were warned. But they went ahead anyway. They've alienated a large body of students politically near them who don't go for confrontation politics."[57/]

Recently the SDS had a national convention which was filled with conflicts over goals, tactics, and simply the question of survival of the organization.

"SDS is at a turning point," observed 26 year-old Dennis Sinclair, a Vietnam war veteran and formerly the national coordinator of the Peace

and Freedom party. "We're either going to become a massively based political organization that will relate to the outside world or an elitist organization not concerned about the group's relations to the masses."[58]

If the New Left and campus dissent are to continue to be an active force it may be that an organization other than SDS will provide the necessary leadership.

Although he is much less sanguine about the prospects of the New Left, Professor Walzer says flatly that black power "will win." He adds that this will not be the black power of separatism advocated by many of the new militants, but the political style of people like Stokes and Hatcher who will be able to utilize the new militancy created by others to gain political power and equality.[59] Certainly this is consistent with what appears to be the major sentiment within the ghetto. A recent poll conducted for CBS indicated that only about 6% of ghetto residents believed in separatism.[60] At this point the idea of black power is more contained in the rhetoric of the "leaders" many of whom may have been created by the mass media. The black power movement, like the New Left movement, has the problem of obtaining converts to their cause. The overt- anti-white sentiment among some black leaders, as well as occasional anti-semitic feeling, make it difficult to gain white recruits. This has resulted in a large dropoff in financial support among some organizations. This means, of course, that the recruitment must be done among the black community. This has been a difficult task traditionally because of the feeling of hopelessness, although there is some evidence of greater recent activism among many ghetto residents.

Professor Walzer suggests that these organizations will encounter the same process as have other once radical movements within this country. As they organize and grow in strength they will confront the Establishment and gain some victories, and affect the functioning of the established order. However, in the process of acquiring the victories they will lose the radical call to action

which originally had such great appeal among their followers.[61/] Although many people at the time will call it a defeat, in retrospect it will be seen as something of a victory that so many of their original proposals which sounded so radical became part of the Establishment. The activists in the labor movement in this country during the 1930's are an excellent example.

These young people read their history well, are acutely uncomfortable with the prospect of being swallowed up by the Establishment and aim to prevent it, if possible. It is difficult to see, however, how young radicals can remain so estranged throughout their lives without reaching some sort of mutual accommodation with the larger society or become politically impotent. It will be to those who come after them to call to society's attention the ills of our nation in the future.

December 1968
Revised June 1, 1969

FOOTNOTES

1/ The Boston Globe, September 26, 1968. Barnes, Dick. "Youth Impact: Outvoted 9-1."

2/ Peterson, Richard E. "The Student Left in American Higher Education," Daedalus. (Winter, 1968). p.295.

3/ Ibid., p.294.

4/ Kahn, Melvin. "Students for McCarthy--What Unites Them." Trans-Action. (July/August, 1968).

5/ Draper, Hal. Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, Grove Press, Inc., New York, 1965. p.170.

6/ Kelman, Steven. "The Feud Among the Radicals," Harper's. (June, 1966).

7/ SDS flyer, Boston University, (November, 1968). (Mimeographed).

8/ The New York Times, December 29, 1968. Kovach, Bill. "N.A.A.C.P. Plans New Drive in Slums."

9/ Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Bantam Books, New York, 1968.

10/ Ibid., p.228.

11/ Hentoff, Nat. "Interview with Eldridge Cleaver," Playboy, (December 1968).

12/ The New York Times, May 5, 1969. Collier, Barnard L. "S.D.S. Scores Big Gains But Faces Many Problems."

13/ The Boston Globe, July 14, 1968. Semas, Phil. "Factions Shatter Plans for SDS Unity."

13a/ The New York Times, December 29, 1968. Weinraub, Bernard. "Split Threatens Student Parley."

14/ The New York Times, May 5, 1969. op. cit.

15/ Crisis at Columbia. Report of the Fact-Finding Commission Appointed to Investigate the Disturbances at Columbia University in April and May, 1968. Vintage Books, New York, 1968. p.54.

16/ Keniston, Kenneth. Young Radicals. Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York, 1968.

17/ Ibid., p.70.

18/ Flacks, Richard. "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest," Journal of Social Issues. XXIII, 3. (July, 1967). p.141.

19/ Walzer, Michael. "The New Left," Speech at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass., December 12, 1968.

20/ Old Mole. Number 12, Boston, Mass. April 22-May 9, 1969.

21/ Keniston, Kenneth. The Uncommitted. Delta Publishing Company, New York, 1965.

22/ Newfield, Jack. A Prophetic Minority. Signet Books, New York, 1966.

23/ Keniston, Kenneth. Young Radicals. p.202.

24/ Draper, Hal. op. cit.

25/ Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

26/ The New York Times, December 15, 1968. Weinraub, Bernard. "Student Radicals Losing Ground at City College."

27/ Walzer, Michael. op. cit.

28/ Keniston, Kenneth. Young Radicals. pp.287-289.

29/ The Black Power Revolt, Floyd B. Barbour, ed. Carmichael, Stokely. "Power and Racism." Extending Horizons Press, Boston, Mass., 1968. p.70.

30/ Ibid., McKissick, Floyd B. "Programs for Black Power." p.179.

31/ Draper, Hal. op. cit. p.98.

32/ The New York Times Magazine, December 29, 1968. Searle, John R. "A Foolproof Scenario for Student Revolt."

33/ The Boston Globe, January 10, 1969. "Black Students' 10 Demands."

34/ Harvard Alumni Bulletin, April 28, 1969. p.30.

35/ Abrams, Elliot. "Cambridge Patterns," The New Leader, April 28, 1969. p.7.

36/ Ibid.

37/ Eleven Days at Brandeis. "A Report on the Student Seizure of Ford Hall, January 8-18, 1969." Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

38/ Patriot-Ledger, Quincy, Mass., January 9, 1969. "Coercion Out, Abram Says."

39/ Ibid.

40/ Providence Sunday Journal, January 12, 1969. "65 Negroes Suspended at Brandeis."

41/ Harvard Alumni Bulletin, April 28, 1969. p.27.

42/ Ibid.

43/ The New York Times, May 18, 1969. Arnold, Martin. "New Breed of College Chief Hunted."

44/ The New York Times, May 11, 1969. Kifner, John. "Colleges Step Up Changes in Bid to Avert Disruption."

45/ The New York Times, May 5, 1969. Stevens, William K. "M.I.T. Curb on Secret Projects Reflects Growing Anti-military Feeling Among Universities' Researchers."

46/ Rights in Conflict. A Report Submitted by Daniel Walker, Director of the Chicago Study Team, to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Bantam Books, New York, 1968. p.2.

47/ Ibid., pp.10-11.

48/ Crisis at Columbia. p.182.

49/ Ibid., p.198.

50/ The Boston Globe, October 17, 1968. Stewart, Richard H. "Ombudsmen Part of Nixon's Youth Service Agency Proposal."

51/ The New York Times, December 15, 1968. Turner, Wallace. "Hayakawa Move Puts Off a Crisis."

52/ Ibid., May 25, 1969.

53/ Generations Apart. C.B.S. Report, May 27, 1969.

54/ The New York Times, December 29, 1968. Kovach, Bill. op. cit.

55/ Ibid., January 5, 1969. Roberts, Steven V. "Smart and Sophisticated Young People Who Aided Kennedy and McCarthy Seek New Energy Outlet."

56/ Walzer, Michael. op. cit.

57/ The New York Times, December 15, 1968. Weinraub, Bernard. op. cit.

58/ Ibid., December 29, 1968. Weinraub, Bernard. op. cit.

59/ Walzer, Michael. "The New Left," The University and the New Intellectual Environment. Aiken et al. St. Martin's Press, New York, 1968.

60/ Buckley, William F. Firing Line, December 1968.

61/ Walzer, Michael. "The New Left."